

6 people ; Who/What 3) Term-ltd.
 Students Seasonal 2) no \$ not in Budget
 bec not sure of terms of settlement

Stewart, Cynthia

From: McElheran, Pearl
Sent: Monday, March 23, 1998 5:17 PM
To: Addis, Leslie; Bishop, Robin; Davis, Don; Napolitano, Jim; Preugschat, Dave; Stewart, Cynthia; Wendy Keller; Wright, Larry
Subject: FW: Schedule for Council Logan/Knox Sessions
Importance: High

From: Gay, Debora
Sent: Monday, March 23, 1998 5:15 PM
To: Bissonnette, Pam; Campbell, Nancy; Cruz, Ricardo; Derrick, Robert; Duerr, Brad; Garfield, Leonard; Gletne, Barbara; Larsen, Craig; McElheran, Pearl; Plough, Alonzo; Steel, Pat; Toliver, Paul; Wagner, Vern; Wallenstein, Arthur; Whitney, Sheryl
Cc: ZZGrp, OBSP Office Analysts; ZZGrp, OBSP Supervisors; Addis, Leslie; Amos, John; Anglin, Evans; Anshutz, Jim; Aratani, Tim; Arima, Debbie; Bodoia, John; Bouffiau, Sean; Buck, James; Burns, Doug; Caluza, Rudy; Cantu, Jim; Clawson, Susan; Cline, David; Crane, James; DeLeon, Jose; Dempsey, Tom; Drangsholt, Tim; Duggirala, Krishna; Dynes, Dennis; Emby, Michael; Francis, Roy; Frawley, Michael; Greenough, Carol; Greenough, Linda; Harris, Grace; Harris, Helen; Holmes, Reginald; Hultengren, Ruth; Inouye, Randy; Jaramillo, Chris; Kitnikone, Noy; Kniestedt, Robert; Krecklow, Jill; Leaf, Mark; Lindley, Marty; McCracken, Jon; Mitchell, Duncan; Mock, Carolyn; Nieto, Ruben; O'Connor, Casey; Oien, Steve; Ortiz, Cathy; Reid, Barbara; Richards, Chris; Schaefer, Kerry; Scharrer, Greg; Schmitz, Vicki; Sherfey, Paul; Sheridan, Laurel; Solemsaas, Rachel; Solomon, Barbara; Weiss, Carin; Wilson, Bill; Yamane, Juliette
Subject: Schedule for Council Logan/Knox Sessions
Importance: High

OBSP has received the schedule for the working sessions on the Logan/Knox Ordinances by Council's BFM committee. BFM staff have requested that each department have a representative who will present the reasons for their requested FTEs (see my earlier e-mails for more details, or contact your budget analyst). The Council has sequenced department presentations by the number of requested FTEs (smaller requests first). Again, the first session is Wednesday, 3/25, from 4:30 to 6:00 pm in the 12 floor Southwest conference room. The second session is Monday, 3/30, from 4:30 to 6:00 pm at the same location. Thank you.



our Logan/Knox sh/ include:

• Dave S.	1.0	\$
• Anna	.75	
• Therese	1.0	
• Clare	1.0	
3.75		
• Roda Tech	1.0	
• .5 maint.	.5	
4.75		

Term Ltd. 2.75

5 PAII Survey
 we proposed 1.5 FTE PAII
 turned into one FTE
 .5 committee staff
 .5 PAII → .5 PAI

(4) p

Agency		Knox-Logan FTEs	
Wednesday 3/25			
	Information & Admin. Services - Adm	0.50	
	Community Services Division	0.75	
	Employee Benefits Program	1.00	
	Fed Housing & Comm Dev Fnd	1.00	
	ITS Technology Services	1.00	
	Open Space Acquisition	1.00	
	Property Services	1.00	
	Solid Waste	1.00	
	Transportation Planning	1.00	
	Veterans Services	1.00	
	Mental Health	1.50	
	Work Training Program	1.58	
	Deputy County Executive	2.00	
	Licensing & Regulatory Services	2.00	
	Office of Budget & Strategic Planning	2.00	
	River Improvements	2.00	
	Safety & Workers' Comp	2.00	
	Sheriff (Public Safety)	2.00	
	Airport	2.50	
	Office of Cultural Resources	2.50	
	Youth Services	3.00	
	Finance Internal Svc Fund	4.00	
	Records & Elections	4.20	
	Judicial Administration	6.00	
	Public Health Fund	13.00	
	Transit	13.00	72.53
Monday 3/30			
	DCFM - Internal Service Fund	19.50	
	Wastewater Treatment Division	25.00	
	Water and Land Resources (SWM)	28.00	
	Roads	36.50	
	Parks & Recreation	48.70	157.70

Stewart, Cynthia

From: Scordamaglia, Donya
Sent: Monday, March 23, 1998 3:33 PM
To: Stewart, Cynthia
Subject: RE: Your Write-ups on Extra Help



Airport

Cynthia--

FYI. See below. The Logan/Knox Body-of-Work ordinances are up in Council BFM on Wednesday, and there is purportedly an evening briefing also, in which a department representative is expected to attend. I believe this announcement went out to Directors, so Pearl may have already alerted you. Please give me a call if you have any questions. Susan should be back tomorrow.

--Donya

From: Cornwall, Catherine
Sent: Monday, March 23, 1998 12:30 PM
To: Bender, Sid; Branigan, Sally; Broz, Stephen; Faber, Millie; Faucette, Bobbie; Goldberg, Beth; Harris, James-Budget; Mai, Hanh; Manning, Nathalie; Mapranath, Jos; Merrell, Frederica; Scordamaglia, Donya; Thurman, Darcia; Valles, Christa
Cc: Soper, Craig; Gay, Debora; Cole, Susan; Flaherty, Terri
Subject: Your Write-ups on Extra Help

I've given copies of the analyst write-ups on the department requested positions for Logan Knox to BFM Staff. The version I gave to Council staff are on the L drive. Please make sure that your department has a copy of the write-up. Attached is a list of all the write-ups.

Since Sid is out this week, I assume someone from Susan's section will make sure that Airport and Roads gets a copy of their write-ups. Thanks.

<<File: Analyst.doc>>

Catherine Cornwall, Senior Policy Analyst/Acting Budget Supervisor
Office of Budget & Strategic Planning
296-3490

Body of Work Review Form

Date: 1/15/98

Department and Agency: Airport/DCFM

Analyst: Sid Bender

I. BODY OF WORK FTE REQUEST - COMPLIANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS

- A. Did the department include all of their Class A and B temporary employees on the Body of Work Review Worksheet? **Yes**
- B. Did the department use the correct codes to describe the position and its disposition (see the Code Instructions Body of Work Review Worksheet)? **The TT code has been added where appropriate.**
- C. Did the department fill out the Career Service Body of Work Review Form for each new requested classification of position? *Departments are supposed to fill out these forms for each classification of positions they are requesting. For example, if they are requesting two clerical positions, they could fill out one form. If the department is requesting two clerical positions, one bus driver, and three program analysts, they should fill out three forms. The department does not have to fill out the form for positions that are going away (the work has been completed or discontinued); that are being reassigned (an existing position will pick up the work); or that are truly temporary in nature (election day workers).* **The Department filled out a separate body of work form for each classification of positions requested. There were three PA IV's requested and a BOW form was completed for each one. However, given that each position is responsible for a unique body of work it is appropriate to have separate forms.**

II. REQUESTED FTEs

Please answer the following questions for each grouping of requested positions (i.e. if the department requested 3 FTEs to perform the same body of work, you would answer these questions once). Note: every effort should be made to ensure that extra help work is converted into full time positions - and not half time positions.

*Radio Tech
these* Summary: **Recommending 2.5 FTE and 2.75 Term Limited Positions**

*anna (Trade)
Dave B. (app shyway)
Doris CIP (E)*
: **Funded from existing budget authority (CIP, Extra Help, program budget)**

International Trade Initiative (60%)/Other Projects (40%)

⇒ **Number of New Positions Requested: .75 Term Limited Position**

⇒ **Amount of New Funding Needed: 0**

⇒ **Body of Work to be Performed by New Positions (please describe): The term limited position discussed in this form works on projects involving international trade and other**

research and projects regarding other Airport issues. This work includes the development of issue papers, conducting trade analysis and overseeing projects.

- A. Is the body of work currently being performed by temporary employees important enough that it needs to continue (i.e. is it mandatory)? What will happen if the body of work does not continue? **The body of work is not mandatory; however, there is an increased likelihood of the International Trade Program success if this body of work is continued.**
- B. Can the department reassign the work to existing employees? **A small portion.**
- C. Can existing vacancies be used to perform the work? **In the 1998 budget there is a new .5 FTE position in the International Trade Initiative that could be used to partially fund the PA IV position requested for this body of work.**
- D. What will happen if the department does not receive their requested FTEs? **The Director of the International Trade Initiative would assume as much as possible of the current body of work and the remaining work would not be completed.**
- E. Is the cost of the new position fully offset by the reduction in extra help expenses? If not, what is the additional cost? *Note: if a temporary employee had exceeded the 910/1040 hour limit, they should have been paid an additional 15% in lieu of benefits. This 15% should closely, if not fully, offset the increased cost of medical and retirement benefits.* **This position will not be offset with extra help dollars but will instead be supported by a reprogramming of CX dollars in the 1998 budget for the International Trade Initiative.**
- F. Are there other accounts which could be decreased to offset the cost of the new positions? **The proposed International Trade budget can be modified to support the 0.75 term limited position..**
- G. Analyst Comments: **To continue this body of work for the International Trade Initiative, it is recommended that approximately \$28,000 of reprogrammed International Trade Initiative budget authority (CX backed). Approximately \$22,000 of the reprogramming will involve the 1998 funding approved for the 0.5 PA1 FTE.**

Opportunity Skyway Program

- ⇒ **Number of New Positions Requested: 1 Term Limited Position**
- ⇒ **Amount of New Funding Needed: 0**
- ⇒ **Body of Work to be Performed by New Positions (please describe): The term limited position requested on this form directs the Opportunity Skyway Program. This responsibility involves the following tasks: develop and manage program budget; develop policies for the program; develop and maintain relationships with educational systems; supervise teachers and other program staff; work with other departments to obtain and fund staff.**

- A. Is the body of work currently being performed by temporary employees important enough that it needs to continue (i.e. is it mandatory)? What will happen if the body of work does not continue? **Yes. This position is necessary to successfully implement the Opportunity Skyway Program.**
- B. Can the department reassign the work to existing employees? **No. The Airport staff is not able to absorb the Opportunity Skyway workload performed by the employee at issue in this term limited position request.**
- C. Can existing vacancies be used to perform the work? **There is an existing Program Analyst IV vacancy; however, there is sufficient Opportunity Skyway funding to available to support this term limited position request.**
- D. What will happen if the department does not receive their requested FTEs? **The Opportunity Skyway Program would not be adequately implemented.**
- E. Is the cost of the new position fully offset by the reduction in extra help expenses? If not, what is the additional cost? *Note: if a temporary employee had exceeded the 910/1040 hour limit, they should have been paid an additional 15% in lieu of benefits. This 15% should closely, if not fully, offset the increased cost of medical and retirement benefits.* **The term limited position request is funded by the Opportunity Skyway Program.**
- F. Are there other accounts which could be decreased to offset the cost of the new positions? **The program funding is sufficient to fund this term limited position.**
- G. Analyst Comments: **This position is necessary to implement the Opportunity Skyway Program and there is sufficient program funding available to support this position without affecting the Airport financial plan ending balance.**
-

Radio Technician

⇒ **Number of New Positions Requested: 1 FTE**

⇒ **Amount of New Funding Needed: 0**

⇒ **Body of Work to be Performed by New Positions (please describe):**

- A. Is the body of work currently being performed by temporary employees important enough that it needs to continue (i.e. is it mandatory)? What will happen if the body of work does not continue? **Radio maintenance is an important function at the Airport for vehicles and emergency systems. Vital communication links will be jeopardized if they are not adequately maintained. This is particularly important in support of the Police and Firefighter low org.**
- B. Can the department reassign the work to existing employees? **No one is trained at the Airport to continue this body of work.**
- C. Can existing vacancies be used to perform the work? **No.**

- D. What will happen if the department does not receive their requested FTEs? **The Airport is likely to request this as an FTE add in the 1999 budget (possibly making a supplemental request for the 1998 budget).**
- E. Is the cost of the new position fully offset by the reduction in extra help expenses? If not, what is the additional cost? *Note: if a temporary employee had exceeded the 910/1040 hour limit, they should have been paid an additional 15% in lieu of benefits. This 15% should closely, if not fully, offset the increased cost of medical and retirement benefits.* **Yes. The Airport agrees that the 1.0 FTE can be funded from their extra help budget.**
- F. Are there other accounts which could be decreased to offset the cost of the new positions? **The extra help budget is sufficient to fund this position.**
- G. Analyst Comments: **The radio maintenance responsibilities at the Airport justify the approval of an FTE. The Airport believes the position can be funded from the extra help budget without reducing the projected financial plan ending balances.**
-

Noise Study CIP

⇒ **Number of New Positions Requested: 1 Term Limited Position**

⇒ **Amount of New Funding Needed: 0**

⇒ **Body of Work to be Performed by New Positions (please describe):**

- A. Is the body of work currently being performed by temporary employees important enough that it needs to continue (i.e. is it mandatory)? What will happen if the body of work does not continue? **Yes. This position is necessary to successfully implement the Airport Noise Study CIP.**
- B. Can the department reassign the work to existing employees? **No. The Airport staff is not able to absorb the Noise Study CIP workload performed by the employee at issue in this term limited position request.**
- C. Can existing vacancies be used to perform the work? **There is an existing Program Analyst IV vacancy; however, there is sufficient Noise Study CIP funding to support a significant share of this term limited position request.**
- D. What will happen if the department does not receive their requested FTEs? **The Noise Study CIP cannot be adequately implemented and the Airport master plan approval process may be delayed.**
- E. Is the cost of the new position fully offset by the reduction in extra help expenses? If not, what is the additional cost? *Note: if a temporary employee had exceeded the 910/1040 hour limit, they should have been paid an additional 15% in lieu of benefits. This 15% should closely, if not fully, offset the increased cost of medical and retirement benefits.* **The cost of this term limited position request can be funded by a combination of Noise Study CIP (001334) budget, extra help budget authority and PA IV salary savings due to an existing vacancy.**

- F. Are there other accounts which could be decreased to offset the cost of the new positions? **There is sufficient budget authority to fund this term limited position.**
- G. Analyst Comments: **This position is necessary to complete the Noise Study CIP and assist in the Master Plan approval process. According to the Airport, there is sufficient existing budget authority to support this position without affecting the Airport financial plan ending balance.**
-

Noise Monitoring CIP/Other Airport Tasks

⇒ **Number of New Positions Requested: 1 FTE**

⇒ **Amount of New Funding Needed: 0**

⇒ **Body of Work to be Performed by New Positions** *(please describe):*

- A. Is the body of work currently being performed by temporary employees important enough that it needs to continue (i.e. is it mandatory)? What will happen if the body of work does not continue? **Yes. This position is necessary to successfully implement the Airport Noise Monitoring System CIP and other Airport tasks.**
- B. Can the department reassign the work to existing employees? **No. The Airport staff is not able to absorb the CIP workload performed by the employee at issue in this FTE position request.**
- C. Can existing vacancies be used to perform the work? **No. There is an existing Office Tech. III FTE vacancy but it will be filled in early 1997. § 2.**
- D. What will happen if the department does not receive their requested FTEs? **The Noise Monitoring System CIP and other tasks will not be completed.**
- E. Is the cost of the new position fully offset by the reduction in extra help expenses? If not, what is the additional cost? *Note: if a temporary employee had exceeded the 910/1040 hour limit, they should have been paid an additional 15% in lieu of benefits. This 15% should closely, if not fully, offset the increased cost of medical and retirement benefits. The FTE request can be funded by the Noise Monitoring System CIP (001332) budget and extra help budget authority.*
- F. Are there other accounts which could be decreased to offset the cost of the new positions? **Available CIP and extra help budget authority is sufficient to fund this FTE position.**

Analyst Comments: **This position is necessary to implement the Noise Monitoring System CIP and other Airport tasks and there is sufficient budget authority.**

Maintenance Staffing

⇒ **Number of New Positions Requested: .5 FTE**

⇒ **Amount of New Funding Needed: 0**

⇒ **Body of Work to be Performed by New Positions** *(please describe):*

- A. Is the body of work currently being performed by temporary employees important enough that it needs to continue (i.e. is it mandatory)? What will happen if the body of work does not continue? **The Airport is currently understaffed in the maintenance function and cannot absorb a body of work reduction equivalent to a .5 FTE. The The Airports additional 2 FTE's approved in the 1998 budget to address the maintenance understaffing were requested on the assumption that the .5 FTE work would continue to be funded.**
- B. Can the department reassign the work to existing employees? **No. According to the Maintenance supervisor the maintenance function is understaffed.**
- C. Can existing vacancies be used to perform the work? **There are no vacancies in the Maintenance low org.**
- D. What will happen if the department does not receive their requested FTEs? **A share of the Airport's maintenance tasks will not be completed.**
- E. Is the cost of the new position fully offset by the reduction in extra help expenses? If not, what is the additional cost? *Note: if a temporary employee had exceeded the 910/1040 hour limit, they should have been paid an additional 15% in lieu of benefits. This 15% should closely, if not fully, offset the increased cost of medical and retirement benefits.* **Yes. The Airport agrees that the .5 FTE can be funded from their extra help budget authority.**
- F. Are there other accounts which could be decreased to offset the cost of the new positions? **The extra help budget is sufficient.**
- G. Analyst Comments: **The Airport Director and Maintenance supervisor are convinced that the maintenance function is currently understaffed (and will remain so if this .5 FTE is not approved despite the addition of 2 FTE's in the 1998 budget). The Financial Plan ending balance will not be decreased with the addition of this .5 FTE because the Extra Help budget is sufficient to finance this position.**